

# THE REHEARSAL.

Numb. 55

1. The ORIGINAL State of Nature shew'd to be a State of Government and Subjection, not of Independency.
  2. St. Paul of a Different opinion from Mr. Lock, as to Adam's Right by Creation.
  3. The first Government by Institution, as well as Nature.
  4. A Vindication of the Fifth Commandment from the Trifling of Mr. Lock.
- An Advertisement. Concerning Sandwich. The Review, and Experiment.

From Saturday August the 11th, to Saturday August the 18th. 1705.

Country-m. **I** Come now to hear, Master, how Government Began among Mankind. And how it has been Deduc'd to Us from the Beginning. For that is the Point we are Chiefly Concern'd in.

Rehears. The Erecting of Government among the Spirits of Heaven, and the first Rebellion against it there, will be of Mighty Use to Us, in our Inquiry after the Nature of Government, and Rebellion among Mankind. Therefore the first of our six Homilies against Rebellion, begins with this Revolt of Lucifer and his Angels, as the Source and Spring of all Rebellion among Men.

(1.) Government is Dependency, when One Depends upon Another. It is Superiority, when One is Superior, and Another Inferior. Therefore they who wou'd have the Original of Government in the People, are Oblig'd to Suppose a State of Independency among all Mankind, when no Man in the World had any Dependence upon any other Man; And when No Man was Superior to Another. This they Call the State of Nature. And if such a State cannot be shew'd their whole Scheme falls to the Ground.

But they Happen'd ill to Call this the State of Nature, among a Race of Mankind, who all came into the World by Generation. And Nature has Imprinted nothing more strongly upon all Mankind, than the Duty and Dependence of Children towards their Parents, and the Superiority of Parents over their Children. And where either Parents or Children offend against this Law of Nature, the Parents not taking Care of, and Providing for their Children; Or the Children in not Returning Duty and Obedience to their Parents; such are Call'd Un-Natural. This is the Common sentiment of all Mankind. Therefore this suppos'd INDEPENDENT State of Mankind must be Look'd for among the Pre-Adamites. Or, we must suppose a Shower of Men dropping out of the Clouds, without Fathers or Mothers, all upon the Level. Or, that Men were Created in Multitudes, like the Beasts, Birds, Fish, and Fowl. And then indeed Two Men Created at the same time, and not Deduc'd the one from the other, wou'd be Independent as to Nature. But without that, the INDEPENDENT State cannot be the State of Nature; but Directly Contrary to it.

(2.) Now, Country-man, let Us Observe, How God Deligning Man for Government, Express'd it in the Oeconomy of his Creation, and Founded it in very Nature. To Obviate these Falsly suppos'd Presences of the Natural State. He Created but one Man. And did not Create the Woman at the same time, lest she might have Pleaded Independency. But made her afterwards out of the Man. Which shew'd her Dependency upon him. And she was made for his use, as an Help Meet for Him. The Apostle Argues the

Authority of the Man over the Woman, from His being first Created. 1. Tim. 2. 12, 13. I suffer not a Woman to Teach, or to Usurp Authority over the Man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first Formed, then Eve.

Country-m. Our Renowned Mr. Lock, in his Two Treatises of Government, which you have before taken Notice of, Laughs at this Argument. Which having been Urg'd by Sir Rob. Filmer, Mr. Lock Answers Book. 1. Chap. 3. p. 19. That this Argument will make the Lion have as good a Title to it (the Government) as he (Adam) and Certainly the Ancients. Says he.

Rehears. Cou'd this pass from a School-boy? It is Answer'd like a Merry-Andrew. Besides the utter Contempt of, and Burlesking the H. Scriptures. But we must suppose Mr. Lock (like the Rest of our Common-wealth-men) little Conversant in those Sacred Oracles; where they can find nothing favouring their Popular Schemes. otherwise I cannot think, that Mr. Lock, who pretended to Sobriety, and a Character; wou'd have Attack'd the Argument of the Apostle, in the Person of Sir Rob. Filmer, if he had known it.

(3.) But to go on. I urge not Nature alone for the Foundation of Government. Only I have gone thus far upon the Argument of Nature, to shew, That the State of Nature, which our Whiggs set up and Recurr to it upon all Occasions, was not a State of Independency, as they wou'd have it.

Now I proceed to shew, that God did not Leave it wholly to Nature, tho' the Arguments from Nature were Strong against the State of Independency: But he likewise Added his positive Command and Institution for Government, betwixt Adam and Eve, before there were any other of Mankind in the World, saying to Eve, Gen. 3. 16. Thy Desire shall be to thy Husband, and he shall Rule over thee. Or, as our Margin Reads it, Thou shalt be subject unto him. Or art Commanded to be under Obedience, as the Apostle words it. 1. Cor. xiv. 34.

Country-m. It is Exceeding Plain, that there was no State of Independency then. And that, both from Nature, and the Positive Institution of God. Otherwise Eve might have Disputed it with Adam, and Claim'd the Breeches, as some of her Daughters have done since.

But now Master, when Children were Born to Adam, how did it go then?

Rehears. I have told you before, That there is no Dictate of Nature more Impress'd upon us, than the Obedience of Children to their Parents. Besides the frequent Commands of God in H. Scripture for the same. As Children Obey your Parents in all things. Coloss. 3. 20. And this is call'd The first Commandment with Promise. Eph. vi. 2. And the Promise is Remarkable, That it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest Live long upon the Earth. I say this is Remarkable, Considering that in this Command our Duty to our

God

Governors is Contained, who are our Political Fathers; And our Rebellion against them, and taking the Sword, will cause us to Perish by the Sword, and Shorten our Days. And this is even a Natural Consequence, besides the Threatning of God, and his Promise, that it shall be well with us, if we be Obedient.

God expresses his own Authority over us, by what we owe to our Natural Fathers. As he says, *Mal. 1. 6.* If I be a Father, where is mine Honor?

(4.) Country-m. Mr. Lock thinks, or at least says, that the Power of the Mother was Equal to that of the Father over the Children. And thence wou'd perswade us, that nothing of Government is Included in the 5th. Command. He says, *Book. 1. Chap. vi. p. 76.* that the Fifth Command, was so far from Establishing the Monarchical Power of the Father, that it set up the Mother equal with him. Then he Quotes a great many Texts where Children are to Honor Father and Mother. And concludes, p. 78. I do not Remember that I any where Read, Children Obey your FATHER and no more, the Scripture Joyns MOTHER too in that Homage which is due from Children. And he Employs a whole Chapter *Book. 2. Chap. vi.* to Prove the Mother's Title Equal to that of the Father's over their Children.

*Rehearsal.* No doubt there is Honour and Obedience due from Children to their Mother, as well as to their Father. But to the Mother in Subordination to the Father. So that if their Commands shou'd Interfere, that of the Father must take place.

And the Dominion and Rule of the Husband over the Wife, and her being made Subject to him, which I have shew'd before, duly consider'd, it cannot be suppos'd, That her Power was Equal to his over their Children. The Mother has a Power and Authority over her Children. But the SUPREAM Power is Only in the Father. For he Commands both Mother and Children. Therefore God when he Asserts his SUPREAM Authority over us, calls himself our Father, but never our Mother. If I be a FATHER, where is mine Honour? Whence some have thought, that our Duty to God our Father is contain'd in the 5th. Command, and therefore Reckon'd it into the first Table, of what Relates to God.

But that it Relates to our Spiritual and Political Fathers, to our Governors in Church and State, is the Common and Receiv'd Opinion of the Christian Church. And Express'd in our Catechism, in our Duty towards our Neighbour. Where Immediately after, Honour thy Father and Mother, follows, by way of Explanation, to Honour and Obey the King, and all that are put in Authority under him. To submit our selves to all our Governors, Teachers, Spiritual Pastors and Masters. To Order our selves Lowly and Reverently to all our Betters. Where the whole Oeconomy of Government, from the Highest to the Lowest, is all Included under the 5th. Commandment, and Deduc'd from it.

This is shew'd more at Large in *Bishop Overall's CONVOCATION-BOOK. p. 25.* where it is said, That it is Generally agreed upon, that Obedience to Kings and Civil Magistrates is Prescrib'd to all Subjects in the Fifth Commandment, where we are Enjoyn'd to Honour our Parents. Whereby it followeth, That Subjection of Inferiors unto their Kings and Governors, is Grounded upon the very Law of Nature; and consequently, That the Sentences of Death, awarded by God himself, against such as shew'd themselves Disobedient and Incurrible to their Parents, or Curs'd them, or Struck them, were likewise due unto those, who Committed any such Offences against their Kings and Rulers, being the Heads and Fathers of their Common-Wealths and Kingdoms.

Here is the Authority of the whole Church of England in Convocation Assembled, against Mr. Lock in an Explanation of a Text of Scripture. And for his Criticism, wherein he shews his Will, and found it out, (being Cunning!) that Mother is Joyn'd with Father in the 5th. Command, it is no more an Objection than where Inferior Governors are Joyn'd with the Supream, in the Commands of our Obedience to them. As *1. Pet. 2. 13.* Submit your selves— Whether to the King as Supream, or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by Him. Will any say here, That there is no Supremacy given to the King, because other Governors are Joyn'd with him, in the same Command of Obedience? As much and no more, do's the Mother being Joyn'd with the Father in the 5th. Command, take away the Supremacy of the Father! And yet so Fond is Mr. Lock of this, as he thought, new Discovery, That he says, p. 272. Had but this one thing been well Consider'd— it wou'd have Ended all the Dispute about Fatherly Authority, by setting up two Co-ordinate Monarchs, the Father, and the Mother.

#### ADVERTISEMENT.

I Am told, that the *Observer* (which I have not seen, for I read no more that *Scurrilous Paper*) do's Insult, because no Answer is given to those Affidavits he has Printed relating to the Flag hung out at Sand wich, upon the Day of the late Election there. And Infers that the *Rehearsal*, by his silence, yields what he said to be False. The *Rehearsal* did not think it needful to take any Notice of these Affidavits, because they are nothing to the Purpose, nor do they Contradict the Affidavits of *Joseph Hunger* and *George Broad*, Printed in *Rehearsal, N. 46.* Which do not so much as Name some Persons, which the other Affidavits take pains to Clear from having done that Deed. So that this is wholly Trifling. Again the Affidavits of *Joseph Hunger* and *George Broad* do not Positively Assert that this Flag did belong to a Troop of Horse in the time of *Oliver Cromwell*, only, that they did Take it to be so, and Believ'd it, and that it was *Francis Hook* who had Caus'd it to be Hung out. But they name not the Window, or any Window out of which it was Hung, nor who did it, but as they Suppose. But that such a Flag was Hung up, at the *Ana-Baptist Meeting-House*, and that they took Particular Notice of it, and of the Arms Decipher'd upon it. And that it was not the same Flag which *Francis Hook* afterwards Produc'd to the Mayor of the Town, unless Alter'd, this they Positively Swear. Against which nothing is said in the other Affidavits, but that such a one, and such a one did not do it, and such a one did not See it, and it was not Hung out at such a Window. All which makes nothing against what the Two fore nam'd had Sworn.

In the same *Rehearsal, N. 46.* are set down Certificates to Disprove the Villanous LIE of the Review, about the *Weather-Cock* at Oxford. And *Rehearsal, N. 44.* Disproves another as Notorious a Falshood of the Review, in Odium to the Church of England, which he Asserts to Positively, as that if it be Otherwise, he Promises, For ever to lay down this Cause, and not to say one Word more to it. Yet he Writes on still, with as much Fury (by way of Moderation) against the Church as Ever. And without so much as Offering to Justify or Retract his *Weather-Cock*, and other as Gross Impositions upon the Credulity of the Vulgar to Enflame the Nation, and Prejudice them against the Church Established. Shou'd I now call him to Repentance, and to make good his Promise? Or to Retract and make Satisfaction to the World for his very Lying Book call'd *The Experiment*, about *Abraham Gill*, Prov'd to be such by Certificate from the Present Lord Bishop of Chester, Published in several Gazetts? In that Book he lays Load, with all his Venom, upon the Church of England, and Turns his own Shortest Way upon Her: (He is still Fond of that Performance!) And Provokes any to Disprove one word of the Facts he Relates. Yet being undenyably Disprov'd, in the Principal Point, he Blushes not, nor thinks of Repentance! These Men's Principle is, To do no Right, and take no Wrong. They Boldly call upon others, to make Good what they say. To Prove, or to Retract. But when Requir'd from Themselves, they Laugh and make a Jest of it, and go on still in their Wickedness. And make no Scruple to Repeat the same Disprov'd LIES and SLANDERS over and over again, with Re-Doubl'd ASSURANCE!

This by way of Advertisement. For I will not be Diverted from the Thread of the Subject I am upon, to follow Men Destitute of Common Honesty or Shame. But my Satisfaction is, that I have fully shew'd them to be such. And so I have Left them.